UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,014	01/26/2004	Craig Nevill-Manning	24207-10065	1277

62296   7590   11/12/2008
GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/765,014	NEVILL-MANNING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MIRANDA LE	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 August 2008</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,8-15,18,19,22-28 and 32-40</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,8-15,18,19,22-28 and 32-40</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/24/08</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 08/07/08.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-15, 18-19, 22-28, 32-40 are pending in this application. In the

Amendment, claims 39-40 have been added. This action is made Final.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent
and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the
patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the
abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an
improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should
include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly
those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use
thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use
thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the
abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of
the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

<u>**Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given**</u>.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the

obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each

claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order

for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35

U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 15, 18, 19, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Manber et al. (US Patent No. 6,920,609), in view of Bailey

et al. (US Patent No. 6,785,671).

As to claims 1, 15, Manber teaches a method/computer program product,

comprising:

receiving a search query *(i.e. query, col. 5, lines 57-38)*;

identifying a plurality of item identifiers *(i.e. a list of items, col. 7, lines 51-62)*

responsive to the search query *(i.e. Some web pages may have several alternative*

formats which are quite different and cannot be inferred from one to another. For

example, results of a search for a particular author may return a list of authors matching

the name, or a list of books by the uniquely named author, col. 7, lines 40-51), wherein

each item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale and comprises

information regarding the item *(i.e. a list of books from the same authors, each with a*

description and a price, col. 7, lines 51-62);

selecting a first group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers *(i.e.*

The operator is able to select or highlight portions of the page that are of interest, e.g.,

the price of product P and/or the red-formatted ON SALE text, col. 6, lines 31-54),

wherein the first group of item identifiers was received from a vendor feed, the vendor

feed comprising information from at least one vendor offering one or more items for sale

(i.e. the techniques of the present invention are particularly useful for identifying and

extracting information related to products from remote vendor servers, col. 5, lines 31-

58);

selecting a second group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers

(i.e. At step 140, another page (e.g., related document) is retrieved ... from a different

site, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28), wherein the second group of item identifiers was

obtained by extraction of item identifiers *(i.e. At step 170, the results of the comparison*

are used to extract the desired information from the subsequent page to be stored (e.g.,

in database 35) and/or displayed. Any number of subsequent pages may be retrieved

and analyzed with respect to the stored pattern of the target page by repeating steps

140 to 170, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28) from shopping documents offering one or

more items for sale *(i.e. a different site, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28)*, the shopping

documents not received directly from a vendor feed *(i.e. Such information can be used,*

for example, to populate database 35 with comparative information for access by

subscribers or the general public, e.g., over the Internet. For example, the extracted

information can be used to populate database 35 with comparative pricing information

for a particular product or service or related products or services. One example of such

an accessible server/database for which the invention is useful is the Yahoo! Shopping

website. It will of course be apparent that the present invention is useful for identifying

and extracting any desired information in web pages retrieved from any website for use

in any data mining application or other application, col. 5, lines 37-58); and

Manber does not expressly teach at least one item identifier from the first group

in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group.

Bailey teaches at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct

way from at least one item identifier from the second group *(i.e. FIG. 3 illustrates a*

sample results page for an All Products search. The results include items directly

offered for sale by the host merchant web site, items offered for sale by third parties

using the host web site as a forum, items offered for sale by on-line merchants affiliated

with the host merchant, and items offered for sale by on-line merchants unaffiliated with

the host merchant, col. 3, lines 37-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching

of Manber, and Bailey at the time the invention was made to modify the system of

Manber to include the limitations as taught by Bailey. One of ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to make this combination in order to display the results of a

multiple-category search according to levels of significance of the categories to a user's

search query in view of Bailey (Summary), as doing so would give the added benefit of

assisting users efficiently in conducting online searches as taught by Bailey (Summary).

As to claims 4, 18, Manber teaches the extraction is performed at least in part

by a template-based extraction method *(i.e. extracting content from web pages*

formatted using a markup language, col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 7).

As to claims 5, 19, Bailey teaches the extraction as based at least in part on the

search query *(i.e. The keyword index is used by a query server to locate web pages that*

are both relevant to a user's search query and likely to include a product offering. This

may be accomplished, for example, by limiting a scope of the search to web pages

having a score that satisfies a particular threshold, col. 2, line 60 to col. 3, line 9).

As to claims 8, 22, Bailey teaches the first group of item identifiers comprises

displaying a first list *(i.e. Top search results from Amazon.com for Mark Twain, See Fig.*

3) and wherein displaying the second group *(i.e. Additional Matches for Mark Twain for*

Mark Twain from other on-line merchants, See Fig. 3) of item identifiers comprises

displaying a second list, wherein the first list is visually separated from the second list

when displayed *(i.e. FIG. 3 illustrates a sample results page for an All Products search.*

The results include items directly offered for sale by the host merchant web site, items

offered for sale by third parties using the host web site as a forum, items offered for sale by on-line merchants affiliated with the host merchant, and items offered for sale by on-line merchants unaffiliated with the host merchant, col. 3, lines 37-43).

As to claims 9, 23, Bailey teaches the first group of item identifiers comprises displaying a first grid and wherein causing the output of the second group of item identifiers comprises displaying a second grid, wherein the first grid is visually separated from the second grid when displayed *(i.e. FIG. 3 illustrates a sample results page for an All Products search. The results include items directly offered for sale by the host merchant web site, items offered for sale by third parties using the host web site as a forum, items offered for sale by on-line merchants affiliated with the host merchant, and items offered for sale by on-line merchants unaffiliated with the host merchant, col. 3, lines 37-43).*

As to claims 10, 24, Manber teaches:

selecting a third group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers, wherein the third group of item identifiers was obtained by a source different from direct receipt from a vendor feed and extraction from shopping documents *(i.e. Any number of subsequent pages may be retrieved and analyzed with respect to the stored pattern of the target page by repeating steps 140 to 170, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28)*; and

Bailey teaches displaying at least one item identifier from the third group *(i.e. RELATED PRODUCTS, See Fig. 3)* in a visually distinct way from the at least one item

identifier from the first group *(i.e. Top search results from Amazon.com for Mark Twain,*

See Fig. 3) and from the at least one item identifier from the second group *(i.e.*

Additional Matches for Mark Twain for Mark Twain from other on-line merchants, See

Fig. 3).

Claims 11-14, 25-28, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Manber et al. (US Patent No. 6,920,609), in view of Bowman et

al. (US Patent No. 7,124,129), and further in view of Bailey et al. (US Patent No.

6,785,671).

As to claims 11, 25, Manber teaches a method/computer program product,

comprising:

receiving a search query *(i.e. query, col. 5, lines 57-38)*;

identifying a plurality of item identifiers *(i.e. a list of items, col. 7, lines 51-62)*

responsive to the search query *(i.e. Some web pages may have several alternative*

formats which are quite different and cannot be inferred from one to another. For

example, results of a search for a particular author may return a list of authors matching

the name, or a list of books by the uniquely named author, col. 7, lines 40-51), wherein

each item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale and comprises

information regarding the item *(i.e. a list of books from the same authors, each with a*

description and a price, col. 7, lines 51-62);

selecting a first group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers *(i.e.*

The operator is able to select or highlight portions of the page that are of interest, e.g.,

the price of product P and/or the red-formatted ON SALE text, col. 6, lines 31-54);

selecting a second group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers

(i.e. At step 140, another page (e.g., related document) is retrieved ... from a different

site, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28);

Manber does not specifically teach:

determining a first degree of certainty that each item identifier from the first group

item identifiers has been correctly associated with a respective item;

determining a second degree of certainty that each item identifier from the

second group of item identifiers has been correctly associated with a respective item;

and

displaying a representation of the first degree of certainty, a representation of the

second degree of certainty, and at least one item identifier from the first group in a

visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group.

Bowman teaches: determining a first degree of certainty that each item identifier

from the first group item identifiers *(i.e. for each item identified in query result, Step 801,*

Fig. 8) has been correctly associated with a respective item *(i.e. initialize ranking value*

for item, Step 802, See Fig. 8);

determining a second degree of certainty that each item identifier from the

second group of item identifiers has been correctly associated with a respective item

(combine scores for item to generate ranking value for item, Step 806, Fig. 8);

displaying a representation of the first degree of certainty, a representation of the

second degree of certainty *(Figs. 10-13)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Manber, Bowman at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Manber to include the limitations as taught by Bowman. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate ranking values for items indicating their level of relevance to the current query in view of Bowman (col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 10), as doing so would give the added benefit of rating scores may be produced by a rating function that combines different types of information reflecting collective and individual user preferences, as taught by Bowman (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 18).

Manber, Bowman do not explicitly teach at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group.

Bailey teaches at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group *(i.e. FIG. 3 illustrates a sample results page for an All Products search. The results include items directly offered for sale by the host merchant web site, items offered for sale by third parties using the host web site as a forum, items offered for sale by on-line merchants affiliated with the host merchant, and items offered for sale by on-line merchants unaffiliated with the host merchant, col. 3, lines 37-43).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Manber, Bowman and Bailey at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Manber, Bowman to include the limitations as taught by Bailey. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to display

the results of a multiple-category search according to levels of significance of the

categories to a user's search query in view of Bailey (Summary), as doing so would give

the added benefit of assisting users in conducting online searches as taught by Bailey

(Summary).

As to claims 12, 26, Bowman teaches first degree of certainty is based at least

in part on a first method of obtaining the item identifiers *(i.e. for each item identified in*

query result, Step 801, initialize ranking value for item, Step 802, Fig. 8) of obtaining the

item identifiers *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29)*.

As to claims 13, 27, Bowman teaches the first method obtaining the item

identifiers in the first group comprises receiving item identifier information from a vendor

feed *(i.e. <www.amazon.com>, col. 7, line 1)*, the vendor comprising information from at

least one vendor offering one or more items for sales *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29)*.

As to claims 14, 28, Bowman teaches the second degree of certainty is based

at least in part on a second method *(combine scores for item to generate ranking value*

for item, Step 806, Fig. 8) of obtaining the item identifiers, the second method

comprising extraction of item identifiers from shopping documents *(i.e. a rating tables*

col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 20) offering one or more items for sale, the shopping

documents not received directly form a vendor feed *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29)*.

As per claim 36, Bowman teaches the method of claim 11, wherein the first

degree *(i.e. for each item identified in query result, Step 801, initialize ranking value for*

item, Step 802, Fig. 8) of certainty is based on a reliability measure of the information

received from a vendor feed *(i.e. <www.amazon.com>, col. 7, line 1; col. 8, line 37 to*

col. 8, line 29).

As per claim 37, Bowman teaches the method of claim 11, wherein the second

degree *(combine scores for item to generate ranking value for item, Step 806, Fig. 8)* of

certainty is based on a reliability measure of the information obtained through extraction

of item identifiers from shopping documents *(i.e. a rating tables col. 8, line 51 to col. 9,*

line 20) offering one or more items for sale, the shopping documents not received

directly from a vendor feed *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29)*.

As per claim 38, Bowman teaches the method of claim 11, wherein the first

degree of certainty is based on determination of accuracy of the information provided for

each item, the information obtained by one of extraction from shopping documents and

receipt from a vendor feed *(i.e. for each item identified in query result, Step 801,*

initialize ranking value for item, Step 802, combine scores for item to generate ranking

value for item, Step 806, Fig. 8; col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29).

As per claim 39, Bowman teaches the vendor feed comprises a data stream

received from the at least one vendor *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Manber, Bowman at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Manber to include the limitations as taught by Bowman. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate ranking values for items indicating their level of relevance to the current query in view of Bowman (col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 10), as doing so would give the added benefit of rating scores may be produced by a rating function that combines different types of information reflecting collective and individual user preferences, as taught by Bowman (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 18).

As per claim 40, Bowman teaches the data stream includes data describing an attribute of an item offered for sale by the at least one vendor *(col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Manber, Bowman at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Manber to include the limitations as taught by Bowman. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate ranking values for items indicating their level of relevance to the current query in view of Bowman (col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 10), as doing so would give the added benefit of rating scores may be produced by a rating function that combines different types of information reflecting collective and individual user preferences, as taught by Bowman (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 18).

Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (US Patent No. 6,920,609), in view of Bailey et al. (US Patent No. 6,785,671), and further in view of Bowman et al. (US Patent No. 7,124,129).

As per claim 32, Manber, Bailey teach the method of claim 1, but do not teach:

determining a degree of certainty that an item identifier has been correctly associated with an item; and

displaying a representation of the degree of certainty.

Bowman teaches: determining a degree of certainty that an item identifier has been correctly associated with an item *(i.e. for each item identified in query result, Step 801, initialize ranking value for item, Step 802, combine scores for item to generate ranking value for item, Step 806, Fig. 8)*;

displaying a representation of the degree of certainty *(Figs. 10-13)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Manber, Bailey, Bowman at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Manber, Bailey to include the limitations as taught by Bowman. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate ranking values for items indicating their level of relevance to the current query in view of Bowman (col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 10), as doing so would give the added benefit of rating scores may be produced by a rating function that combines different types of information reflecting collective and individual user preferences as taught by Bowman (col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 18).

As per claim 33, Bowman teaches the method of claim 32, wherein the degree
(i.e. for each item identified in query result, Step 801, initialize ranking value for item,
Step 802, Fig. 8) of certainty is based on a reliability measure of the information
received from the vendor feed *(i.e. <www.amazon.com>, col. 7, line 1; col. 8, line 37 to*
col. 8, line 29).

As per claim 34, Bowman teaches the method of claim 32, wherein the degree
of certainty is based on a reliability measure of the information obtained through
extraction of item identifier from shopping documents *(i.e. a rating tables col. 8, line 51*
to col. 9, line 20; col. 8, line 37 to col. 8, line 29).

As per claim 35, Bowman teaches the method of claim 32, wherein the degree
of certainty is based on a determination of accuracy of the information provided for each
item, the accuracy determination based at least in part on whether the information was
received from a vendor *(i.e. The facility then combines the scores identified for each*
item to generate ranking values for a relatively small number of items, which may
include items not identified in the query result. Indeed, these embodiments of the
invention are able to generate ranking values for and display items even in cases in
which the query result is empty, i. e., when no items completely satisfy the query, col. 3,
lines 11-36).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/07/08 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Manber teaches or suggesting "selecting a group of item identifiers

received from a vendor feed".

a group of item identifiers limitation equates to *a particular product page for*

product P of Manber, col. 6, lines 1-25 *(i.e. at step 100 an operator using client device*

20 (or server 30) <u>first selects a target page that is deemed a model page for a particular</u>

<u>product type, company format, or any other type of document</u>. For example, the

operator accesses a particular product page for product P from one of servers 50.sub.1

to 50.sub.N, which corresponds to a particular remote **vendor***'s website, col. 6, lines 1-*

25, Manber).

a vendor feed limitation equates to *a particular remote vendor's website*, col. 6,

lines 1-25 *(i.e. at step 100 an operator using client device 20 (or server 30) <u>first selects</u>*

<u>a target page that is deemed a model page for a particular product type, company</u>

<u>format, or any other type of document</u>. For example, the operator accesses a particular

product page for product P from one of servers 50.sub.1 to 50.sub.N, which

corresponds to a particular remote **vendor***'s website, col. 6, lines 1-25, Manber).*

Applicants describe the term <u>a vendor feed information as a data stream from the</u>

<u>vendor</u> and can include the item identifiers that the vendor is offering for sale and

attributes associated with each item, such as a price of the item, and an image of the item ([0027], Specification). Accordingly, Manber teaches the step of selecting <u>a target page as a particular product page for product P</u> from one of servers, which <u>corresponds to a particular remote vendor's website</u> (col. 6, lines 1-25).

Therefore, the information in a particular product page for product P of Manber equates to a vendor feed information of Applicants.

It should be noted that the limitation "a price of the item, and an image of the item" is not recited in all the dependent and independent claims.

<u>Manber teaches "determining degrees of certainty that item identifiers are correctly associated with respective items".</u>

Manber teaches:

The first group of item identifiers (i.e. a particular product page of Manber) from vendor feed (i.e. a particular remote vendor's website of Manber) *(i.e. the operator accesses a particular product page for product P from one of servers 50.sub.1 to 50.sub.N, which corresponds to a particular remote vendor's website, col. 6, lines 1-25, Manber).*

The second group of item identifiers (i.e. another page of Manber) from shopping documents (i.e. different site of Manber) *(i.e. At step 140, another page (e.g., related document) is retrieved from the same vendor site or from a different site, col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 28, Manber).*

The step of comparing a first string of a first page and a second string of a second page to determine the similar of two pages, col. 3, lines 4-14 *(i.e. wherein the first area of interest is identified by a first portion of the first string of symbols. The method also typically includes the steps of retrieving a second web page, parsing the second web page to determine a second string of symbols associated with the HTML tags of the second web page, comparing the first and second strings to determine whether the second string includes a second portion similar to the first portion of the first string, wherein the second portion corresponds to a second area of interest in the second page, and thereafter extracting the second area of interest from the second page. In preferred aspects the steps of selecting the model page and identifying a first area of interest are performed manually, and the remaining steps are performed automatically, col. 3, lines 4-24, Manber).*

Therefore, Manber teaches the step of determining the similar of an item in the first page with a respective item in the second page.

Manber does not specifically teach the degrees the determination.

Bowman, in complement, teaches determining a degree of certainty that each item identifier from the group of item has been correctly associated with a respective item *(i.e. the item having item identifier "1883823064" has been selected by users more frequently than the item having item identifier "9676530409" , and much more frequently than the item having item identifier "0801062272". In additional embodiments, the facility uses various other data structures to store the rating scores, such as sparse arrays, col. 5, lines 27-43, Bowman).*

A degree of certainty that each item identifier limitation equates to *the score "22"*
of the item identifier "1883823064" of Bowman, col. 5, lines 27-43 (i.e. ", the item having
item identifier "1883823064" has been selected by users more frequently than the item
having item identifier "9676530409", col. 5, lines 27-43, Bowman).

a respective item limitation equates to *item identifier "9676530409" (i.e. ", the*
item having item identifier "1883823064" has been selected by users more frequently
than the item having item identifier "9676530409", col. 5, lines 27-43, Bowman).

correctly associated limitation equates to the more frequently selection an item of
Bowman *(i.e. ", the item having item identifier "1883823064" has been selected by*
users more frequently than the item having item identifier "9676530409", col. 5, lines
27-43, Bowman).

The first group of item limitation equates to list of items 301 to 303 in Fig. 3 of
Bowman.

The second group of item limitation equates to list of items 304 to 306 in Fig. 3 of
Bowman.

The first degree limitation equates to 1, 22, or 7 in Fig. 3 of Bowman.

The second degree limitation equates to 3, 16, or 45 in Fig. 3 of Bowman.

It should be noted that an item of Bowman could be a particular product among
all of the products that can be purchased, col. 1, lines 25-34 *(i.e. Many World Wide Web*
sites permit users to perform searches to identify a small number of interesting items
among a much larger domain of items. As an example, several web index sites permit
users to search for particular web sites among most of the known web sites. Similarly,

many online merchants, such as booksellers, permit users to search for particular

products among all of the products that can be purchased from a merchant. In many

cases, users perform searches in order to ultimately find a single item within an entire

domain of items, col. 1, lines 25-34, Bowman).

The teachings of Manber and Bowman are directed to the same field as online

product purchasing, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art to

modify the step of determining the similar of an item in the first page with a respective

item in the second page of Manber to including the step of determining a degree of

certainty that each item identifier from the first group of item has been correctly

associated with a respective item as taught by Bowman. One of ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate ranking values for

items indicating their level of relevance to the current query in view of Bowman (col. 2,

line 56 to col. 3, line 10), as doing so would give the added benefit of permitting users to

search for particular products among all of the products that can be purchased from a

merchant as taught by Bowman (Background of the invention).

Therefore, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent

a patentable over the art of record.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 10:00 AM to
6:00 PM.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, James K. Trujillo, can be reached on (571) 272-3677. The fax number to
this Art Unit is (571)-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should
be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.
Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Miranda Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169